

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5 and 7-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 17 and 19-21 are amended and claim 4 is canceled. Claim 17 is amended to correct antecedence. Support for amended claims 1, 5 and 19-21 may be found in the original specification at, for example, original claim 17. Support for amended claim 17 may be found in the original specification at, for example, original claim 1. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants' appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Ford in the January 16, 2008 interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1, 5, 7-18 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to computer software void of computer readable medium. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1 and 5

Claim 1 is directed to an information output system including a designated output printing apparatus that produces printed output of outputting information included in the electronic mail issued from a transportable terminal apparatus. Printing information is clearly a tangible feature and is more than merely computer software as alleged by the Patent Office.

Claim 5 is directed to an information output system including a printer group including a plurality of printers. A plurality of printers is clearly a tangible feature and is more than merely computer software as alleged by the Patent Office.

Thus, with respect to claims 1 and 5, and dependent claims therefrom, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 are respectfully requested.

Claim 17

Claim 17 is amended to include the feature of "said designated output printing apparatus produces printed output of outputting information included in the electronic mail issued from said transportable terminal apparatus." Thus, claim 17 includes a feature that is tangible and more than merely computer software as alleged by the Patent Office.

Thus, with respect to claim 17, and dependent claims therefrom, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Patent Office included the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

- Claims 1, 19 and 20 as allegedly being unpatentable over JP 11-312068 ("JP 068") in view of JP 11-312055 ("JP 055");
- Claims 4, 16-18 and 21-22 as allegedly being unpatentable over JP 068 in view of JP 055, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,716 ("Eldridge");
- Claims 5 and 7-13 as allegedly being unpatentable over JP 068 in view of JP 055, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,028,102 ("Larson"); and
- Claims 14 and 15 as allegedly being unpatentable over JP 068 in view of JP 055, further in view of Larson, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,832,208 ("Chen").

Applicants respectfully traverse each of the above rejections.

Claims 1, 5, 17 and 21

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an information output system including an accounting processor (claims 1 and 21) or an accounting processing section (claims 5 and 17) for performing accounting processing prior to outputting of information included in the electronic mail, and allowing a designated output printing apparatus to produce printed output of the information included in the electronic mail

from a transportable terminal apparatus after executing a charging processing, as recited in claims 1, 5, 17 and 21.

The Patent Office concedes that neither JP 068 nor JP 055 teach or suggest the above feature and relies on Eldridge as allegedly disclosing this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Eldridge merely discloses providing a user with a list of available print services, including printing costs. However, providing a user with information regarding the cost of a printing service is not the same as providing accounting processing and charging processing prior to outputting information in electronic mail (e.g., prior to printing the documents in the electronic mail) as required in claims 1, 5, 17 and 21. That is, displaying the cost of the print service is not the same as actually charging the cost of the print service. Thus, nowhere does Eldridge teach or suggest an accounting processing section for performing accounting processing prior to outputting of information included in electronic mail, and allowing a designated outputting printing apparatus to produce printed output of the information included in the electronic mail from a transportable terminal apparatus after executing a charging processing, as required in claims 1, 5, 17 and 21.

Claims 19 and 20

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an information output method in which electronic mail is utilized (claim 19), or a storage medium in which a program to be executed on a computer is stored (claim 20), including an information output system including performing accounting processing prior to outputting of information included in electronic mail, and allowing a designated output printing apparatus to produce a printed output of the information included in the electronic mail from a transportable terminal apparatus after executing a charging processing (claim 19), or a module for performing accounting processing prior to outputting of information included in

electronic mail, and allowing a designated output printing apparatus to produce printed output of the information included in the electronic mail from a transportable terminal apparatus after executing a charging processing (claim 20).

As discussed above, the Patent Office concedes that neither JP 068 nor JP 055 teach or suggest the above features and relies on Eldridge as allegedly disclosing these features. Again, Applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5, 17 and 21, Eldridge merely discloses providing the user with the list of available print services, including print and cost. However, providing a user with information regarding the cost of a printing service is not the same as performing accounting processing and charging processing prior to outputting of information in the electronic mail (e.g., prior to printing the documents in the electronic mail) as required in claims 19 and 20. That is, displaying the cost of the print service is not the same as actually charging the cost of the print service. Thus, for at least the same reasons as presented above with respect to claims 1, 5, 17 and 21, Eldridge also fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 19 and 20.

Larson and Chen

Larson and Chen also fail to teach or suggest an accounting processor or an accounting processing section/step as above. Thus, Larson and Chen also fail to remedy the deficiencies of JP 068, JP 055 and/or Eldridge.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 5, 17 and 19-21, and dependent claims therefrom, are patentable over the applied references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 5 and 7-22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/can

Date: February 4, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461